

REMARKS

Claims 21-27 and 29 are now pending in this application. Further reconsideration of this application is requested.

All previous grounds of rejection have been withdrawn, and new grounds of rejection have been made based on newly cited prior art patents to Han, Jaynes, and Arling et al. It is respectfully submitted that the finality of the outstanding Office action is premature, in that the new grounds of rejection were necessitated not by any amendment to the claims, but rather by the fact that the previously relied upon prior art references did not support the previous grounds of rejection.

In particular, claims 1-20 as originally filed were directed to the same invention as set forth in claims 25-33, with respect to the wireless receiver, voice recognition and manual input keys for controlling tilt and swivel functions. With respect to the keyboard control set forth in claims 21-24, none of the newly cited prior art references is any more relevant than the Pye and Josephson references previously relied on to reject claims 1-20, as none of the Han, Jaynes or Arling et al. references anywhere disclose or suggest such feature. As such, the new grounds of rejection relying on Han, Jaynes and Arling et al. could not be necessitated by the cancellation of claims 1-20 in favor of claims 21-33. Therefore, the finality of the outstanding Office action is premature and should be withdrawn. In any event, the present amendment should be entered as it does not raise any new issue requiring further search or consideration on the part of the Examiner.

The rejection of claims 21, 22, 24, 26 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Han and Jaynes is respectfully traversed. Independent claim 21 requires "a user interface that receives user commands from said keyboard and controls said tilt drive and said swivel drive in accordance with said received commands." The rejection does not state a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the requirements of claim 21.

In particular, the Office action alleges only that "a keyboard, certainly remote keyboards read on the provided reference. As Jaynes demonstrates in a disclosure of a similar invention, input device 200 in figure 4 has a plurality of keys." The Office action has failed to explain how any combination of Jaynes with Han would result in a

computer display device used with a computer having a keyboard, comprising a user interface that receives user commands from said keyboard and controls a tilt drive and a swivel drive in accordance with said received commands. The remote control unit 200 of Jaynes is not a keyboard that is used with a computer, but rather is simply a remote control that sends control signals to a flat panel display to control the viewing angle, the audio volume or the broadcast channel being displayed. See Jaynes at col. 4, ll. 45-60. Similarly, Han neither discloses nor suggests control of the display monitor via a computer keyboard (wireless or otherwise). Contrary to the Office action, the features of claim 21 do not "read" on either Han, Jaynes, or any combination of Han and Jaynes. The rejection is thus submitted to be improper and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully urged.

The rejection of claims 25, 27, 29, 30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Han, also is respectfully traversed to the extent that it may be applied to independent claim 25 as amended. Claim 25 as amended corresponds to claim 28. In this regard, the addition of the Arling et al. patent to the Han disclosure to reject claim 28 also is submitted to be improper. Arling simply discloses a remote control adapted to receive a voice input. Consequently, even if the "remote control" not even shown in the Han reference were to be implemented using the Arling device, the resultant combination still would fail to correspond to the invention of claim 25, which requires a user interface located in said display screen apparatus. The rejection based on the proposed combination of Arling with Han is deficient on its face because it does not address this limitation of the claims. Consequently, any rejection of claim 25 based on the grounds of rejection previously applied to claim 28 would be improper on its face as a matter of law.

Finally, the rejection of dependent claim 23 as allegedly being unpatentable over Han in view of Jaynes and Arling et al. also is submitted to be improper. Claim 23 includes all of the limitations of claim 21, and the addition of the Arling et al. reference to the proposed combination of Han and Jaynes does not cure the basic deficiency of the Han and Jaynes references as applied to claim 21. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is also respectfully urged.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, claims 21-27 and 29 are submitted to be patentable over the prior art of record, whether considered individually or in combination. Entry of this amendment, withdrawal of the outstanding grounds of rejection and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Vincent M. DeLuca Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 32,408				
SIGNATURE	Vincent M DeLuca			DATE	26 APR 04
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck 1425 K Street, N.W., Suite 800				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031